

without merit. There is nothing in the email communications to suggest that Mr. Weiner has acted with a “racist demeanor.”¹ (ECF 74 at 1).

Moreover, upon a review of the emails, Plaintiff appears to be the instigator of a tirade of abuse towards Mr. Weiner and other counsel in this matter. (*See, e.g.*, ECF 76 Ex. A at 4 (“Furthermore, you are a liar”); *id.* at 11 (“As far as I’m concerned your [*sic*] a slime ball”); *id.* at 9 (“Subject: Butt Brain its [*sic*] 300 days in NEW YORK STATE”); *id.* Ex B at 2 (accusing counsel of misrepresentation and fraud)). The parties and their counsel are reminded to treat each other with courtesy and civility.

Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff’s request is **DENIED** and the Clerk of Court is directed to **STRIKE** ECF 74 from the docket; and
2. Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to cease use of any and all abusive language in his communications with Defendants’ counsel. If Plaintiff fails to abide by this direction, the Court may entertain a motion for sanctions against Plaintiff.
3. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 6, 2019
New York, New York

s/ Ona T. Wang

Ona T. Wang
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Plaintiff does not describe or identify Mr. Weiner’s “racist demeanor”; at best, the parties seem to be arguing about a statement in Mr. Weiner’s memorandum of law that indicated that his clients “had been informed (correctly or incorrectly) that Plaintiff (who has a habit of suing prior employers) was currently incarcerated.” (ECF 50 at 3).